

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20, 22 – 32 are currently pending.

The present application was discussed during a telephonic interview with the Examiner on August 15, 2008. Applicants thank the Examiner for agreeing to the interview, and the amendments presented herein reflect those discussed during the interview.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20 and 22 – 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Deleeuw, U.S. Patent No. 5,828,900 (“Deleeuw”). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 in response to this rejection. For instance, claim 1 now requires “receiving from the application a specific request associated with said sentinel value [indicating a pending text event] to disclose said code, wherein said request is generated by the application incident to the application recognizing that said sentinel value represents a type of input event that is capable of being processed by said application.” Similar claim language is also now found in amended independent claims 13, 25 and 30. In light of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that Deleeuw fails to teach or suggest each and every aspect of the amended independent claims.

Deleeuw addresses preventing an application from handling input events and teaches the disablement of the application. Deleeuw, col. 2, ll. 1 – 34; col. 6, ll. 9 - 12. In handling an input event, Deleeuw requires the disablement of an application to prevent event handling. Deleeuw, col. 2, ll. 1 – 34; col. 6, ll. 9 - 12.

Regarding the claimed “request” to disclose a code to the application, the Office Action states “the application accepts all input and is in communication with the input module,

[and] the input module is always receiving a request to disclose said code from the application because as previously noted the application accepts all input.” Office Action, p. 8. As discussed during the telephonic interview, the current claim amendments now make clear that the request is **specifically** associated with a **sentinel value that indicates a pending text event**. Moreover, this request is generated by the application incident to the application “recognizing that said sentinel value represents a type of input event.” Nowhere does Deleeuw teach “receiving from the application a specific request associated with said sentinel value [indicating a pending text event] to disclose said code, wherein said request is generated by the application incident to the application recognizing that said sentinel value represents a type of input event that is capable of being processed by said application,” as required by the claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2 - 6 and 8 - 12, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 14 – 20 and 22 - 24, which depend from claim 13, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 26 - 29, which depend from claim 25, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 25. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 31 and 32, which depend from claim 30, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 30.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20, 22 – 32 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547